



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Chelan County
Project Sponsor: Chelan County Conservation Dist
Project Name: Entiat R. Bridge to Bridge Reach Rest.
Project Number: 04-1503R
Project Location: Entiat River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Chelan County
Project Sponsor: Chelan County PUD
Project Name: Dryden Fish Enhancement CMZ
Project Number: 04-1461R
Project Location: Dryden, Washington
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The sponsor has provided additional information to address the earlier concerns of the Technical Advisors.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

Given the significant property constraints at this site, it is possible that the proposed approach is the best solution to improving fish habitat.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Chelan County
Project Sponsor: Chelan County
Project Name: Wenatchee Instream Flow Habitat
Project Number: 04-1700N
Project Location: Wenatchee River
Project Type: Non-capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Chelan County
Project Sponsor: Jones Shotwell Ditch Board
Project Name: Jones Shotwell Diversion Enhancement
Project Number: 04-1508R
Project Location: Monitor
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

This project involves rebuilding the intake of an existing 600 foot-long diversion ditch, installing a new screen, providing fish passage from the downstream end, and adding LWD in the ditch for habitat purposes. The primary goal of the project seems to be to renovate the aging diversion structure, which happens to be used by juvenile salmonids as rearing habitat. Of the four components of the project, the installation of a new diversion screen will have the most significant benefit. Cost appears to be fairly high for the small amount of habitat gained.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Chelan County**
Project Sponsor: **Chelan County**
Project Name: **Peshastin Creek Fish Barrier Removal**
Project Number: **04-1509 R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The sponsor has provided the additional information requested by the SRFB Technical Advisors.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Chelan County
Project Sponsor: Chelan County Natural Resources Program
Project Name: Irwin CMZ Restoration Project
Project Number: 04-1517N
Project Location: Leavenworth
Project Type: Non-capital/Assessment

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Upon further discussion with the sponsor about the channel restoration options being considered for the feasibility study, the project of concern designation was removed from this project. The feasibility study will evaluate other restoration alternatives besides an engineered backwater channel, including options for greater connectivity between the mainstem and any excavated side channels. The use of log jams and other channel structures that work in conjunction with natural river processes to create off-channel habitat over time are often more successful in the long term than highly engineered approaches.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Chelan County
Project Sponsor: Chelan County Natural Resources Program
Project Name: Gagnon CMZ Restoration Project
Project Number: 04-1538N
Project Location: Cashmere
Project Type: Non-capital, assessment

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The river has a more constricted channel in this location and the design makes more sense than at the Irwin site.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The project has the potential to significantly benefit salmon habitat in the lower Wenatchee.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Chelan County
Project Sponsor: Lake Chelan's Sportman's Assoc
Project Name: Beebe Springs Restoration Phase I
Project Number: 04-1701N
Project Location: Columbia River, near Lake Chelan
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The project has a high cost relative to the size of the potential habitat gain.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Foster Creek
Project Sponsor: Foster Creek Conservation District
Project Name: East Foster Creek Sediment Control
Project Number: 04-1666R
Project Location: East Foster Creek
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why?

We appreciate the effort to estimate sediment volumes potentially removed by the project; however, we are still missing the context for how much this project will affect fine sediment levels in habitat far downstream. We understand that the project is trying to address the priority limiting factor in the watershed, but do not know how many more projects will need to be done before meaningful changes can be expected in habitat conditions within lower Foster Creek. We do not have any estimate of the sediment production from the West Fork or Middle Fork of Foster Creek. The channel incision documented in the West Fork along with the highly efficient transport through its confined lower reach may make this area an even greater contributor of sediment to lower Foster Creek. The proposed project in East Fork Foster Creek will undoubtedly reduce sediment load to the channel, but there is still insufficient information to determine the benefits of the project to the downstream inhabited reach.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Grays Harbor**
Project Sponsor: **Mason County**
Project Name: **Satsop Cloquallum Culvert Replacement**
Project Number: **04-1669R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Fish Passage**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would replace 2 deteriorating stream crossings that are partial barriers with 10-foot wide box culverts set at no slope to improve fish passage primarily for coho but may also benefit chum and steelhead. With about 5.5 km of good quality habitat upstream of both sites, this project would be of significant benefit to salmon.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments. – Information very clear and well presented



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Grays Harbor**
Project Sponsor: **Lewis Conservation District**
Project Name: **Anderson Culvert Replacement**
Project Number: **04-1670R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Fish Passage**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would replace a partial barrier on Stearns Creek with a bridge that would improve passage to 6.6 miles of decent quality habitat primarily for coho and steelhead. The WDFW Priority Index Number for the site is 49.98, which is very high.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The bankfull width of the creek is 24 feet, but it is unclear if the railroad bridge will have adequate length to provide that width for the stream. Also, no consideration was given to potential upstream regrading impacts. Further design information should be provided to address these issues. Please see the WDFW comments.

4. Other comments.

The low cost of this project is appealing.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Grays Harbor Co**
Project Sponsor: **Capitol Land Trust**
Project Name: **Black River Habitat Protection**
Project Number: **04-1667 A**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Acquisition**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The conservation easement on 75 acres of the Berquist property would primarily benefit coho, although Chinook, steelhead and chum historically used the area. Despite the historical impacts of grazing, ditching, and channelizing, the potential exists to provide a significant amount of critical off-channel habitat in the 60 acres of wetlands being protected.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comment.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Grays Harbor**
Project Sponsor: **Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force**
Project Name: **Polson Creek Barrier Correction**
Project Number: **#04-1695**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Fish Passage**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would improve fish passage on a tributary to the WF Hoquiam River that would primarily benefit coho and steelhead, although chum and Chinook could possibly use the area as well. Good project and application put together very well.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Please see the WDFW comments

4. Other comments.

Good local match. The Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force and Grays Harbor County continue to make good progress in address barriers on county roads.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Grays Harbor**
Project Sponsor: **Mason County**
Project Name: **Beeville Rd Culvert Replacement**
Project Number: **04-1668R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Fish Passage**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would replace 2 small squashed culverts with a 16-foot wide squashed oval culvert set at no slope to improve fish passage for coho and chum. The main culvert is undersized, in bad condition, and a velocity barrier. With approximately 6 km of decent quality habitat upstream, this project would be of significant benefit to salmon.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

I would suggest going with a little wider culvert to provide a greater factor of safety. While the average bankfull width was estimated at 15 feet, indications of a flashy stream system with considerable stream power and sediment transport indicate that more cross-sectional area may be warranted to pass flows and debris and to maintain grade upstream and downstream. Describe your plans for maintaining grade (e.g., filling the large pool at the outlet) through this reach.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Grays Harbor Co**
Project Sponsor: **Chehalis Basin FTF**
Project Name: **Vance Creek Riparian Planting & Fencing**
Project Number: **04-1698 R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Sponsor adjusted the project to address the concerns of the Technical advisors and narrowed the scope of the riparian planting and fencing. Produced a nice planting plan map. Project is low cost and high value by involving landowners and the local community.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Good concept and could be a great vehicle for building local support for salmon recovery.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Grays Harbor**
Project Sponsor: **Lewis County**
Project Name: **Lucas Creek Fish Passage**
Project Number: **04-1689R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Fish Passage**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project will improve a significant partial barrier that would improve access to 2.8 miles of good quality habitat for coho and steelhead. The replacement with a 20-foot span is appropriate but some concerns exist about providing grade control through the crossing.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Please see the WDFW comments and consider their suggestions. Good project.

4. Other comments.

Consider work downstream in the large pool as well as upstream and try to mimic natural conditions with large boulders and key wood pieces or jams to create grade control.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Grays Harbor**
Project Sponsor: **Heernet Environmental Foundation**
Project Name: **Mills Property Acquisition**
Project Number: **04-1664A**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Acquisition**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would acquire 30 acres with 0.5 miles along Scatter Creek, which would benefit coho, chum, steelhead, and possibly chinook. The area provides important cold-water refuge for rearing and good spawning habitat

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The technical advisors only concern is that the benefits of this site may diminish significantly if the fish farm and well water input from upstream is discontinued in the future. Any information on habitat conditions prior to the influence of the well water additions may help to alleviate this concern.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Grays Harbor Co**
Project Sponsor: **Chehalis Basin FTF**
Project Name: **Wishkah County Road Sediment Control**
Project Number: **04-1694 R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The road sediment reduction project is proposed for a portion of the mainline county road that receives significant traffic and has a high amount of sediment delivered to the stream network. This section of road also coincides with the reach on the Wishkah River above the hatchery to the bridge crossing with the highest density of Chinook spawning. While the gravel quality in this reach appears to be in fair condition, a reduction in fine sediment would be a benefit to Chinook and other anadromous fish, such as chum and coho.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

This project almost qualifies as a project of concern because of the lack of information provided for the specific work to be performed and at what locations. The work should focus on areas of the road that deliver directly into stream channels and concentrate on the road length below the falls in the canyon at the confluence with Parker Creek (the limit of anadromous fish). Rayonier, Inc. has done a culvert survey and therefore this work should not be necessary as part of the proposal. This culvert survey information could also be used to document the

expected reduction in road length or sediment delivery to streams following the completion of the work.

4. Other comments.

The initial application calls for paving a portion of the road but my understanding is that this is no longer part of the proposal and will substantially reduce the project cost. I agree that paving is not necessary for this road. In addition, while some low spots exist on the road where runoff causes a maintenance problem for the road prism, the SRFB funding should not be used for repairing these areas, as they have no influence on aquatic habitat.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Hood Canal**

Project Sponsor: **Jefferson County**

Project Name: **Dosewallips Floodplain Acquisition**

Project Number: **04-1639A**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Acquisition**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Great site for acquisition!! This one's a no-brainer.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Hood Canal**

Project Sponsor: **Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group**

Project Name: **Little Quilcene Estuary Restoration**

Project Number: **04-1647R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This project involves levee fill removal and passage improvements. It should be relatively straightforward. This appears to be an excellent project.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Hood Canal**

Project Sponsor: **Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group**

Project Name: **Big Quilcene Estuary Dike Removal**

Project Number: **04-1648R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This project involves levee fill removal and woody debris placement. This appears to be an excellent companion project to the Little Quilcene project for nearly full estuarine restoration of Quilcene Bay.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Hood Canal**

Project Sponsor: **North Olympic Salmon Coalition**

Project Name: **Salmon/Snow Lower Watershed Restoration (V)**

Project Number: 04-1649

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This project proposes the companion restoration features on lands formally acquired through SRFB and DFW funding. Good partnership effort between DFW, NOSC, Jefferson Co CD, and Jefferson Land Trust. Well sequenced.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Hood Canal Coor council Inc**
Project Sponsor: **Skokomish Indian Tribe**
Project Name: **Skokomish River & Floodplain Assessment**
Project Number: **04-1712 N**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This system and issues are complicated and require this type of analysis. Great to see an inclusive mixture of stakeholders involved. Need to have a good strategy, though, for how this information is used to generate priorities and future projects.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Hood Canal Coor council Inc**
Project Sponsor: **Mason County Community Dev**
Project Name: **Skokomish Valley Conservation Easements**
Project Number: **04-1713 A**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Acquisition**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Seems like a unique opportunity to protect a particularly valuable area. Well organized with willing landowner.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Hood Canal**
Project Sponsor: **North Olympic Salmon Coalition**
Project Name: **Chimacum Creek Ag Land Restoration**
Project Number: 04-1662R
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The buffers on at least some portions of the proposed project are small. The restoration work would primarily benefit coho and cutthroat. The stream has been significantly altered from channelization, sedimentation, lack of riparian shade and wood, and waste runoff. The project addresses some of the limiting factors, but a great deal more work will be required to restore a semblance of natural processes and functions in the stream. The proposal is higher in the watershed, which means lower benefits at a relatively high cost.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Hood Canal**
Project Sponsor: **Northwest Watershed Institute**
Project Name: **Tarboo Valley Protection and Restoration**
Project Number: **04-1665C**
Project Location: Tarboo Creek flows into Dabob Bay
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Without more specific design and construction plans, it's difficult to evaluate the proposed re-meandering of the stream. The work, however, appears to be relatively straightforward and will rely on site-specific assessments of the topography and hydrology, as well as historical information about channel locations and vegetation.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Hood Canal Coor council Inc**
Project Sponsor: **Kitsap County Public Works**
Project Name: **WF Stavis Creek Culvert Replacement**
Project Number: **04-1318 R**
Project Location: West of Poulsbo
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Originally this was a "Project of Concern". The sponsor adequately provided additional information requested by the SRFB Technical Advisors to address their concerns of the project.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Last remaining barrier in the system. The applicant has worked closely with WDFW on passage design.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Island County**
Project Sponsor: **Skagit River Sys Cooperative**
Project Name: **Arrowhead Lagoon Restoration**
Project Number: **04-1217 R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The sponsor has addressed the SRFB Technical Advisor’s comments regarding the bridge. All other options for improving the associated habitat conditions have been reviewed and were not found to be acceptable alternatives. Both the SRFB and the project sponsor understand that there is a trade-off between bridge costs and the amount of bridge and lagoon fill to be removed, and the sponsor will work to optimize the outcome for salmon recovery.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Island County**

Project Sponsor: **WA Trout**

Project Name: **W. Whidbey Nearshore Fish Use Assessment**

Project Number: **04-1262 N**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

This project focuses on assessing juvenile salmon use in the nearshore of the western shores of Whidbey Island. This project is proposed to be coordinated with the #1 ranked multi-LE assessment, led by the Skagit River System Cooperative. The Skagit River System Cooperative proposal includes budget enhancements to this proposal that would expand the WT study area to include the eastern shores of Admiralty Inlet as well. The information generated from this juvenile salmon nearshore utilization assessment will be incorporated into the Island County and Hood Canal salmon habitat recovery strategies.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: King 8
Project Sponsor: King County
Project Name: Cedar Rapids Restoration Site
Project Number: 04-1660R
Project Location: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The proposed project includes bankline restoration to improve juvenile refuge, improve riparian cover and adult holding habitat. The history of the site was well documented and is the location of previous SRFB acquisition grants for the purpose of this restoration.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This project is good in its approach and well established in its history and need.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: King 8
Project Sponsor: King County Water and Land Resources
Project Name: Shaw-Landsburg- Acquisition
Project Number: 04-1354A
Project Location: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The proposed project would protect 28 acres of riparian and riverfront habitat. Existing habitat conditions appear good. Upland habitat component is small.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: King 8
Project Sponsor: City of Seattle
Project Name: Rainier Beach Shoreline Restoration
Project Number: 04-1594R
Project Location: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The proposed project is intended to modify the shoreline of Lake Washington to enhance the substrate, shoreline geometry and vegetative community. The project is proposed to address shoreline habitat needs by juvenile chinook and sockeye in an otherwise highly degraded shoreline.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Monitoring results (e.g., fish densities) in supplemental application materials support the need for this type of restoration. The monitoring indicates higher fish use densities along the beach in vegetated areas which should spread into the restored shoreline.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: King 8

Project Sponsor: King County Water and Land Resources

Project Name: Issaquah/Carey/Holder- Acquisition

Project Number: 04-1302A

Project Location: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Companion protection project with past SRFB funded projects improving connectivity. Willing and cooperative landowner.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: King 8
Project Sponsor: City of Redmond
Project Name: Bear Creek Mouth Restoration
Project Number: 04-1699R
Project Location: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Well supported technically with a continuation of successful project design and implementation along this reach.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **King 9**
Project Sponsor: **City of Burien**
Project Name: **Seahurst Park Nearshore Restoration**
Project Number: **04-1423R**
Project Location: **Burien**
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project will restore nearshore conditions along 1,000 feet of shoreline that has consistent use by juvenile chinook, chum, coho, sockeye, and steelhead. The landslides from the bluff provide important sediment inputs for forage fish spawning and other benthic prey of salmon. This project should have significant benefits to salmon and has a high likelihood of achieving those benefits. However, no assurances are given that the sediment inputs will be sufficient to avoid future nourishment actions.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Monitoring will be worthwhile here beyond construction to follow recovery of beach.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **King 9**
Project Sponsor: **King County Water and Land Resources**
Project Name: **Piner Point on Maury Island**
Project Number: **04-1335A**
Project Location: **Maury Island**
Project Type: **Acquisition**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project will conserve 1,500 feet of nearshore habitat that has consistent use by juvenile chinook, chum, coho, sockeye, pink, and steelhead. The active landslide complex and its location at the divergence of two drift cells makes this a unique area that is important to maintain nearshore habitat conditions for many miles of shoreline beyond these parcels. While the parcels are within a landslide hazard area, development on one or two parcels would likely occur in the future. This project should have significant benefits to salmon and has a high likelihood of achieving those benefits.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **King 9**

Project Sponsor: **King County DNR**

Project Name: **Lower Newaukum Creek Restoration**

Project Number: **04-1338**

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project is sound and will improve habitat conditions, particularly Newaukum Creek's alluvial valley floodplain. On-site topographic and hydrologic information will ultimately guide the proper design and construction of wood structures.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **King 9**

Project Sponsor: **City of Kent**

Project Name: **Mill Creek/Green River Restoration**

Project Number: **04-1323**

Project Location: **Kent Valley**

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project will provide in-stream complexity and cover for migrant chinook fry and other juvenile salmonids along approximately 1,000 feet of the Green River and lower Mill Creek, respectively. This project addresses a critical habitat feature missing in the lower Green River and should have significant benefits to chinook and other salmon. The wood placement and riparian plantings should be relatively straightforward and has a high likelihood of achieving the stated benefits.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **King 9**

Project Sponsor: **Seattle Art Museum**

Project Name: **Elliot Bay Nearshore Restoration at Olympic Sculpture Park**

Project Number: **04-1421R**

Project Location: **Seattle**

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why?

This project has substantial public support from backers of the new sculpture park and proposes to enhance a short stretch of beach habitat. Proponents propose a beach cover and several hundred feet of fish habitat bench. The project is proposed to support forage fish spawning, epibenthic production and juvenile salmon migration and kelp production. However, the project is sited along a heavily degraded and urbanized stretch of nearshore that will compromise its function and require regular long-term maintenance.

Examples of inherent ecological constraints include altered wave conditions, human need for view corridors and access, and heavy requirement for armored rock.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

The beach cove portion of this proposal is the most likely aspect of the project to provide some, though limited, habitat function from the creation of a fine sediment, backshore, riparian vegetation and shallow subtidal habitat. However, the processes that would normally maintain these components are notably absent. The site is therefore reliant upon human intervention for its sustainability. This reliance on human intervention and lack of fully functioning habitat features makes this site less certain to serve as a “pearl” for juvenile salmon to rest and feed and raises uncertainty over long term success. It is agreed that the cove will be more productive than a stretch of armor rock but the technical advisors do not agree that the expenditure of the requested funds is worth the improvement in nearshore production given the inherent constraints at the site. This project represents a philosophical shift in how and where to spend funds and it is not

entirely clear that from an ecological perspective this site is the appropriate place to make that shift.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

--



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Kitsap**

Project Sponsor: **Kitsap County of**

Project Name: **Kitsap Nearshore Salmon Habitat Assessment**

Project Number: **04-1442 N**

Project Location: East Kitsap Peninsula Shoreline

Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Approach complements methods recently developed for Bainbridge Island. Use of existing expertise should assist in a successful assessment and data analysis/sharing. Fills an identified data gap.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Document assumptions.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Kitsap**
Project Sponsor: **Kitsap County**
Project Name: **Chico Creek Instream Restoration**
Project Number: **04-1209**
Project Location: Near Bremerton
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Opportunity to restore a reach of Chico creek which is a very productive stream. There is obviously a significant need for restoration of this reach. The project is out of sequence a bit, with the box culvert needing correction first. However, the applicant has committed to requesting funding for replacement in the next cycle.

The project location goes through a golf course which can affect the quality of vegetation allowed near the creek. No mention of the vegetative buffers and quality in proposal.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

More detail on allowable vegetative quality and buffer size is needed to ensure the meander belt has enough recruitment of LWD and adequate shading/ prey production for juveniles. Otherwise it seems like a good project.

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Kitsap**
Project Sponsor: **City of Bainbridge Island**
Project Name: **Close Shoreline Acquisition**
Project Number: **04-1308A**
Project Location: West side of Bainbridge Island
Project Type: **Acquisition**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Minimal request of IAC to ensure protection of this area. Since much of the parcel is upland, this seems appropriate.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

The SRFB funded Bainbridge Nearshore Assessment has identified this project site as one of the most important to protect on the Island. This project builds on past Bainbridge Island Land Trust successes but uses the Nearshore Assessment, local planning experience, to propose the project. This project should create momentum for similar land acquisitions around the Island to protect the remaining natural habitat, or restore compromised habitat.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Kitsap**
Project Sponsor: **MPSFEG**
Project Name: **Beaver Creek and Estuary Restoration**
Project Number: **04-1402R**
Project Location: Manchester
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

Encourage project designers to ensure final design is consistent with previous upstream work. Adaptive management approaches well thought out in response to Technical Advisors concerns.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Kitsap**
Project Sponsor: **SPS Salmon Enhancement Group**
Project Name: **Rocky Creek Fish Passage**
Project Number: **04-1380**
Project Type: **Fish Passage**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

These are the last remaining critical barriers to address in this drainage.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Kitsap**

Project Sponsor: **Mid-Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group**

Project Name: **Olalla Creek Fish Passage**

Project Number: **04-1429R**

Project Type: **Fish Passage**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project has been well thought out with much of the design work completed. The passage correction is located near the estuary, would benefit chum and coho, and has a fairly high priority index (PI).

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The 12-foot wide arch pipe appeared to be right at the threshold of the minimum size requirements.

4. Other comments.

Good job highlighting the conifer planting in the riparian zone.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Kitsap**

Project Sponsor: **SPS Salmon Enhancement Group**

Project Name: **Little Minter Fish Passage**

Project Number: **04-1375R**

Project Location: Pierce County portion of Key Peninsula

Project Type: **Fish Passage**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Excellent submittal. Project design is well thought out.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Kitsap**

Project Sponsor: **10,000 Years Institute**

Project Name: **Schel-chelb Estuary**

Project Number: **04-1314C**

Project Location: Schel-chelb Estuary on Bainbridge Island

Project Type: **Restoration and Acquisition**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

The acquisition costs are justified given the developable lot, which will be protected in perpetuity and restored, to intertidal marsh. The project has good landowner and technical support and is well sequenced.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Klickitat County
Project Sponsor: Columbia Land Trust
Project Name: Klickitat River Conservation and Restoration
Project Number: 04-1715C
Project Location: Klickitat River
Project Type: Combined

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Klickitat County
Project Sponsor: WDFW
Project Name: Snyder Creek Mill Site Fish Passage
Project Number: 04-1714R
Project Location: Snyder Creek
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Klickitat County
Project Sponsor: Mid-Columbia RFEG
Project Name: Lower Klickitat Riparian Re-Veg
Project Number: 04-1711 R
Project Location: Klickitat River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Klickitat County
Project Sponsor: Yakama Nation
Project Name: Tepee Creek Fish Passage
Project Number: 04-1716R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Project would replace 3 partial barriers to juvenile salmonids on a tributary to White River that provides important spawning and rearing habitat to steelhead. Additional information was provided by the sponsor to answer the initial concerns of the SRFB Technical Advisors.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Lower Columbia**
Project Sponsor: **Columbia Land Trust**
Project Name: **Germany Creek Conservation and Restoration**
Project Number: **04-1563 C**
Project Location: **Germany Creek**
Project Type: **Acquisition and Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would acquire 155 ac of riparian, floodplain, and associated upland habitat with about 1 river mile including the confluence with the Columbia River estuary. The project would benefit multiple salmonid species, including chum, chinook, coho, and steelhead. Restoration actions focused on chum but also would benefit other species.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Off-channel rearing habitat will be created by connecting old gravel quarry ponds to the stream. Some design issues still need to be resolved but should not affect the certainty of success. Providing basic water surface elevations for the ponds/river would help to evaluate the off-channel pond type. Spawning channel would utilize existing overflow channel in a braided channel reach. While some concerns exist about future channel migration into the spawning channel, the project is still likely to provide important short-term benefits to the threatened

chum. Otherwise, the site location appears to be excellent with a source of cool groundwater upwelling from the hillside.

The success of groundwater channels for chum spawning is dependent on capturing active river groundwater flow within the excavated area, and having enough gradient for the water to flow (which attracts fish). Project location should be based on low-level groundwater pump tests/excavation to ensure these conditions. Also, an assessment of flood frequency relative to project life is needed (for backwater considerations and overland flow upstream).



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Lower Columbia**
Project Sponsor: **Lower Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group**
Project Name: **Lower Washougal Restoration Phase 1**
Project Number: **04-1573R**
Project Location: **Washougal River**
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would construct two boulder dams to shift flow into historical channels providing better spawning habitat for chum and chinook, restore habitat complexity by adding LWD and boulders, and rehabilitate three quarries as ten acres of off-channel habitat that would benefit threatened chum as well as multiple other salmonid species.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

It isn’t clear if you can actually divert the water because no floodplain elevations are provided. A few key elevations around the floodplain could verify this. As part of the design (in order to move the success of permitting along) include a feasibility study that analyzes the basic hydraulics and geomorphology of the site.

4. Other comments.

The long-term viability and function of the rock dams have some uncertainty, but would still provide shorter-term benefits by providing critical habitat to threatened chum stock.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Lower Columbia**
Project Sponsor: **Columbia River Estuary Study Taskforce**
Project Name: **Fort Columbia Tidal Wetland Restoration**
Project Number: **04-1570 R**
Project Location: **Baker Bay near Chinook River**
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project restores tidal connection to a distributary channel and 96-acre wetland in the Baker Bay area of the Columbia River estuary in the Chinook River watershed. The project would benefit multiple salmonid species, particularly chinook by changing an isolated freshwater wetland back to a saltwater marsh.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

It is important to maintain the widest possible connection with tidal influence to realize the project benefits, but this will not be worked out until the design phase is complete. With the need for a self-regulating tide gate, flow velocities may preclude much use of the wetland area by juvenile salmonids. The project’s success may also depend on other shoreline modifications to attract fish in the vicinity and improve the chances of finding the wetland area. Long-term maintenance of the tide gate is also a question.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Lower Columbia**
Project Sponsor: **Ducks Unlimited**
Project Name: **Baker Bay Estuary Restoration**
Project Number: **04-1559 R**
Project Location: **Lower Columbia River, Wallacut Slough**
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would reconnect approximately 40 acres of saltmarsh estuary habitat along Wallacut River near Baker Bay as a result of dike and tide-gate removal that would benefit multiple salmonid species, particularly chinook. The project would also treat invasive plant species.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The breaches should not restrict the flow.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Lower Columbia**
Project Sponsor: **Lower Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group**
Project Name: **Influence of Carcass Analogs Study**
Project Number: **04-1576N**
Project Location: **Lewis and Wind River Watersheds**
Project Type: **Assessment**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

This nutrient supplementation pilot project would help to evaluate the effectiveness of the analog approach to oligotrophic stream systems. The project addresses a potential problem due to a reduction in the historical transport of marine-derived nutrients from salmon carcasses that were likely vital to the productivity of the system. This would primarily benefit juvenile fish including steelhead and multiple other salmonid species in many potential watersheds. The nutrients would be added and monitored for two years.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Lower Columbia**
Project Sponsor: **Lower Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group**
Project Name: **Upper Washougal River LWD Placement**
Project Number: **04-1575R**
Project Location: **Upper Washougal River**
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would primarily benefit steelhead, chinook, and coho by adding ELJ, wood, and rock to capture substrate. This project clearly addresses the critical problem of a lack of large wood and substrate due to splash damming. Probably about 15 ELJs could be constructed for the money and would likely provide both short- and long-term benefits due to anchoring much of the wood into bedrock.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Increase the unit costs for the engineered log jams. It is critical they be sized large enough to restore major channel function. Construction access may be difficult which could drive the cost up. Also, the cost to anchor the jams may be higher than planned.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Lower Columbia**
Project Sponsor: **Grays River Habitat Enhancement District**
Project Name: **PUD Bar Habitat Enhancement – Grays River**
Project Number: **04-1448R**
Project Location: **Grays River**
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why?

(This project is currently under additional review by the Technical Advisors and the evaluation may be updated before the SRFB funding meeting December 2nd and 3rd.)

Upon further review of the supplemental material provided by the applicant, as well as a field visit by a technical advisor, we unfortunately still have concerns about the restoration approach for this reach of the Grays River and have retained the “project of concern” designation.

We view this site of the Grays River as a natural depositional bar. These features are naturally prone to sediment deposition and minor channel shifting. Without a better understanding of the sediment supply and transport to this reach, however, it would be premature to conclude that the site will continue to widen significantly from its present state. The 1966 aerial photographs contained in the Grays River Assessment report shows that the current channel location is similar to its location 40 years ago. While bank erosion and channel widening has occurred as a result of the 1996 floods and potentially from the 1999 Gorley Springs avulsion, the channel pattern has not changed significantly (e.g., from a depositional bar (braided channel pattern) to a straight channel pattern). The river gravels underlying the floodplain silt deposits are an indication that the river has historically shifted its location across this area, so the current loss of channel “stability” may not be that unnatural in a historical context.

The additional information provided discusses the ability of the project to pass sediment (as this was a specific concern brought up by the technical advisors relative to the structures becoming buried). The result of the calculations suggest the channel depth of 4.5 feet is not sufficient to successfully transport sediment and the conclusion reached is the channel depth needs to be 8 to 9 feet. This assessment raises another concern about what will happen upstream and downstream of the site when the channel cross section is changed and this is no longer a depositional bar. What would be the impact of the sediment transported downstream and the changes upstream from the increased water surface elevations?

We support the floodplain revegetation efforts of the project. It appears that this could be accomplished without requiring excavation and engineered structures to deflect flows and aid sediment transport. For direct habitat restoration we advocate a more passive approach with placement of small wood jams that allows natural river dynamics to accommodate the high sediment load and create improved habitat conditions over the long term. The applicant noted they are willing to work with the permitting agencies to ensure a strong wood component for the project.

We share the same long-term goals of establishing dense riparian vegetation dominated by conifer, but we are uncertain about the necessity and efficacy of imposing a more “stable” channel dimension in the short term. Therefore, we still do not feel that the project properly accounts for the conditions and processes in the watershed.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Lower Columbia**
Project Sponsor: **Clark County**
Project Name: **Jones Creek Culvert Replacement**
Project Number: 04-1562R
Project Location: Washougal River Watershed
Project Type: **Fish Passage**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would replace three culverts at a crossing that is a partial barrier (primarily to juveniles) in Jones Creek (tributary to Little Washougal) and open access to about 2.4 miles of generally good quality habitat (although summer low flows are problematic due to water withdrawals) in a rural residential area for coho, sea-run cutthroat, and winter and summer steelhead.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Serious consideration should be given to using a bridge at this site rather than a large culvert because of the channel width and road bed elevation. Also, with a bankfull width of 22 feet and a culvert size of 28 feet wide, this is pushing the limits on stream simulation design.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Lower Columbia**
Project Sponsor: **Underwood Conservation District**
Project Name: **Little Wind River Restoration Planning**
Project Number: 04-1558R
Project Location:
Project Type: **Assessment**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would assess habitat conditions, fish distribution and densities, and develop preliminary designs for fish passage, riparian and stream channel restoration projects in the Little Wind River drainage that would benefit steelhead, coho, and possibly chinook.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Unclear why collecting flow measurements every 2 weeks for 6 months and how this would feed into project development. Estimates of streamflow from cross-sectional work and spot measurements is likely sufficient for project development. If streamflow is going to be measured, suggest installing a data logger, establish a gage site and monitoring continuously and more accurately. This short term data could then be correlated with other local stream gages, and with existing models develop one for the Little Wind.

4. Other comments.

The area probably lacks LWD and has some potentially high temperatures (max 19 deg C), but is likely to provide important habitat in area where little is known.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Lower Columbia**
Project Sponsor: **Lower Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group**
Project Name: **Indian Mary Creek Restoration**
Project Number: 04-1577R
Project Location: **Trib to Franz Lake and Columbia River**
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would replace a complete passage barrier with a bridge to restore access to 3,000 feet of stream channel with decent habitat (provides cold water refuge where Lake Franze warms considerably in the summer) and 10 acres of rearing habitat that would benefit primarily coho and steelhead, but could also benefit chum and juvenile chinook. The project would also place some wood for cover and habitat complexity.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The project cost seems low for a bridge. Perhaps if a Flat car RR bridge is used this will work. The quality of these structures is highly variable and the landowner should be on board for this type of bridge. With the outfall and culvert slope the overall drop is 5 feet. If log weirs are proposed juvenile passage is a concern (0.7 feet drop) seven weirs will be required. Spaced at 20 feet on center will require a 140 foot reach of channel for the construction.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Lower Columbia**
Project Sponsor: **Wahkiakum County Public Works**
Project Name: **Crown Camp Road Culvert Replacement**
Project Number: 04-1553R
Project Location: **Duck Creek, trib to Elochoman River**
Project Type: **Fish Passage**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would address the lower partial barrier (likely a bridge) on Duck Creek (trib to Elochoman Ck), which primarily benefits coho and steelhead by providing improved access to at least one mile and in the future to over 2.85 miles of habitat (including area beyond forestland barrier). Local upstream habitat is generally of poor quality although habitat improves upstream. There are additional partial barriers upstream which plan to be addressed in the next 3 to 4 years. Upper partial barrier has washed out and provides access, but crossing will need to be addressed in the future.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

There is no description of the stream channel work which will be required after the bridge is removed. With the outfall drop of 1.2 and the 2% slope through the culvert the total drop to make up is 2.2 feet. Over the 50 foot length this is a 4.4% slope.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Lower Columbia**
Project Sponsor: **Lewis County Conservation District**
Project Name: **Woods Creek Fish Passage**
Project Number: **04-1565R**
Project Location: **Upper Cowlitz Subbasin**
Project Type: **Fish Passage**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Woods Creek supports primarily coho and possibly steelhead. This project would replace 4 partial barrier culverts with open bottom structures and improve passage to 4.5 miles of good quality habitat upstream.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Primarily a barrier for juvenile fish migration rather than for adults. It is difficult to provide comment on the proposed corrections, because data such as outfall drop, culvert slope, proposed structure sizes, channel regrade, etc are not provided. In general SRFB fish passage projects are evaluated using guidance from Washington State for culvert design.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Lower Columbia**
Project Sponsor: **Clark County**
Project Name: **Emerick Creek Culvert Replacement**
Project Number: **04-1561R**
Project Location: **Trib to Cedar Creek and N. Fk. Lewis River**
Project Type: **Fish Passage**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would replace culverts at two road crossings that are partial barriers (primarily to juveniles) in Emerick Creek (Lewis River watershed) and open access to about 2,600 feet of moderate to poor quality habitat in a rural residential area for coho, sea-run cutthroat, and winter steelhead.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Based on the channel bankfull width of 9 feet the proposed culvert widths need to be larger to meet the stream simulation guidance (2.2 feet for the NE 414th and 3.5 feet for the Munch Road). This size increase may effect the project cost estimate.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Lower Columbia**

Project Sponsor: **Mid-Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group**

Project Name: **Middle Wind River Habitat Enhancement**

Project Number: **04-1554 R**

Project Location: **Wind River, River Mile 14**

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why?

It is unclear how the project will achieve its stated objectives, and the projects main focus is property protection.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

Show how installation of the rock structures would improve spawning habitat and channel complexity. The main concern is the aggrading reach relative to the rock structures. The project sponsor provided information that the structures may become partially buried, but noted they would still direct shear stresses toward the center of the channel. How will this improve spawning habitat and channel complexity if the channel form they create gets buried?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: MASON

Project Sponsor: Capitol Land Trust

Project Name: Oakland Bay / Malaney Creek Habitat Aquisition

Project Number: 04-1464A

Project Location:

Project Type:

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

Y ☐ N ☒

Please see nearshore review comments

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Good match and local partnerships



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: MASON
Project Sponsor: SPSSEG
Project Name: WRIA 14 Nearshore Development
Project Number: 04-1474N
Project Location:
Project Type:

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

.

4. Other comments.

See nearshore review comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: MASON
Project Sponsor: South Puget Sound SEG
Project Name: Hiawata Creek culvert replacement
Project Number: 04-1470R
Project Location:
Project Type:

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Project sponsor appears to have given a lot of thought in solving a difficult problem.

4. Other comments.

Please see the WDFW review. Sponsor provided additional detail on the fill height and bridge length.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: MASON
Project Sponsor: South Puget Sound SEG
Project Name: Jarrell Creek culvert replacement
Project Number: 04-1471R
Project Location:
Project Type:

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Project sponsor appears to have done a lot of preliminary work in pre-project planning.

4. Other comments.

Some questions were raised on the cost/benefit of the project. If a full PI has been completed please provide this information. WDFW calculated 14.9 using the map-generated method. Spring fed system with over one mile of habitat.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Nisqually Indian Tribe**
Project Sponsor: **Nisqually Land Trust**
Project Name: **Nisqually/Powell Protection & Restoration**
Project Number: **04-1637 C**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Combination**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Important piece of property to be purchased along with eliminating two fish passage barriers.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Nisqually Indian Tribe**
Project Sponsor: **South Puget Sound SEG**
Project Name: **Mashel Restoration & Acquisition Phase II**
Project Number: **04-1437 C**
Project Type: **Combination**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

Originally this was a “Project of Concern”. The Lead Entity provided two responses. In the second response they eliminated the in-stream work in the confined channel that was of concern.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Though this project has been removed from the project of concern list, there are still some concerns that should be addressed by the sponsor should the project be funded. See below.

- Clarify who will be purchasing the conservation easements and developing the stewardship plan.
- Work directly with IAC staff and WDFW Technical Assistance on the preliminary design phase for developing the instream projects.
- Developed a detailed scope of work outlining the proposed work and worksite locations.

4. Other comments.



Lead Entity: **Nisqually Indian Tribe**
Project Sponsor: **Nisqually Land Trust**
Project Name: **Miller Shoreline Protection**
Project Number: **04-1658 A**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Acquisition**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Nisqually Indian Tribe**
Project Sponsor: **Nisqually Land Trust**
Project Name: **Nipper Shoreline Protection**
Project Number: **04-1623 A**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Acquisition**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

There is low potential for threat to **salmon** habitat conditions if the protection project is not completed.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This project was removed from the project of concern list. The project sponsor provided the needed detail that included a map of the current and future property lines.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **NOPLE**
Project Sponsor: **Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe**
Project Name: **Dungeness River RR Bridge Reach Restoration**
Project Number: **04-1589R**
Project Location: **Dungeness River immediately below Hwy 101**
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **No**

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This seems like a great project. The need for Habitat diversity is very clear. Currently, pool habitat is almost non-existent within this reach.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **NOBLE**
Project Sponsor: **Agnew Irrigation District**
Project Name: **Agnew/Dungeness Water Conservation**
Project Number: **04-1663R**
Project Location: **Dungeness River**
Project Type: **Upland - Water Conservation**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **No**

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

A proven record of success with projects of this nature in increasing instream flows for fish spawning and rearing habitat by reducing irrigation water withdrawals from Dungeness River.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

It appears this project is consistent with past projects for similar type of work which the LE tech members feel has worked well. The 2 to 4 cfs savings is within the standard error of measurement for stream flow measurements so you can't really monitor it. But, the data presented shows a trend down for water quantity withdrawal.

4. Other comments.

Under the Dungeness Water Users Association/Dept. of Ecology Trust Water Right MOU, 2/3 of conserved water remains as instream flow not available for future water right allocation. 1/3 remains available for agricultural use up to a maximum of 7000 irrigated acres. Agricultural use has remained consistent over the past ten years at 5750 to 6000 acres.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **NOBLE**
Project Sponsor: **DNR – Olympic Region**
Project Name: **Sadie/Susie Barrier Removals**
Project Number: **04-1546R**
Project Location: **Lyre/Hoko River**
Project Type: **Instream passage/habitat**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **No, however...**

Ineligible – SRFB policy does not allow funding of potential Forest and Fish projects.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

RCW 75.46.170 (8) was passed into law in 2000, through Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2589, which states:

"The board may award a grant or loan for a salmon recovery project on private or public land when the landowner has a legal obligation under local, state or federal law to perform the project, when expedited action provides a clear benefit to salmon recovery, and there will be harm to salmon recovery if the project is delayed. For purposes of this subsection, a legal obligation does not include a project required solely as a mitigation or condition of permitting. "

This law provided the SRFB with the authority to fund or not fund projects covered under an existing law...such as fish passage, screens, diversions, etc.

In response to the above law, the SRFB on June 15, 2001 and again on December 5, 2003, declared by policy that "silvicultural treatments and other forest practices" means all activities covered by the Forest & Fish Program and the Forest Practices Act, RCW 76.09. What this means is that the SRFB will not fund fish passage projects (culverts) on lands covered by Forest & Fish Program requirements.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **NOPLE**
Project Sponsor: **North Olympic Salmon Coalition**
Project Name: **Morse Creek Restoration Feasibility Study**
Project Number: **04-1590 N**
Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **NO**
Why?

The proposal offers a clear method for planning future restoration actions. There are many physical constraints and landowner issues that need to be identified and considered before any restoration actions can take place. This project has a high likelihood of achieving that.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **NOPLE**
Project Sponsor: **Clallam County of**
Project Name: **Clallam River Habitat Assessment**
Project Number: **04-1537 N**
Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **NO**
Why?

Sound project design. Needed to help understand periodic river mouth closure issue as well as identifying restoration and protection priorities. Has a high likelihood of achieving its stated objectives.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **NOBLE**
Project Sponsor: **DNR Olympic Region**
Project Name: **Hoko River Habitat Restoration**
Project Number: **04-1547 R**
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **NO**
Why?

This project provides a complex solution to an identified concern. Well sequenced. No obligations to complete project components under Forest and Fish Agreement.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **North Olympic Peninsula**
Project Sponsor: **Fish & Wildlife Dept of**
Project Name: **Nearshore Central Strait of Juan de Fuca**
Project Number: **04-1591 N**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

This project has been revised to focus on assessing juvenile salmon use in the nearshore of the central Strait of Juan de Fuca only. It is complementary to and consistent with all the currently proposed fish use assessments. The applicant has agreed to coordinate with Beamer and Fresh provided their coordination grant is funded. Additionally, the lead entity has submitted a letter of support for the project and its inclusion with all the Multi-LE fish use assessments. All previous technical concerns have been addressed.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Project Sponsor: **Pacific Coast Salmon Coalition**
Project Name: **Bogachiel Culvert Replacement**
Project Number: **04-1592 R**
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This project is a WDFW design, and the key to the project is replacement of the undersized culvert. Final design should address roughened channel design details, calculations etc. Appendix E of the Culvert Design Manual can be used as guidance for this.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Project Sponsor: **Clallam Co Public Works Dept**
Project Name: **Clallam County Culvert Assessment**
Project Number: **04-1510 N**
Project Location: **Clallam County**
Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The applicant understands that the option they have selected can lead to project prioritization with other available information and input from concerned parties. However, some sort of habitat assessment will have to be done later in order to obtain a ranked list of potential projects. In general, a road based inventory is a good starting point, but work will still need to be done in the future to fill in the gaps left by this type of inventory.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **North Olympic Peninsula**
Project Sponsor: **Science/Technology/Manufacturer**
Project Name: **RENEW Clallam Bay Nearshore**
Project Number: **04-1593 N**
Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria?
Why?

YES

1. The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits.
2. The assessment does not account for the processes in the upper watershed.
3. There are significant constraints to the implementation of estuarine, alongshore, and watershed projects.
4. Given the potential restoration projects initially identified, it is unlikely that the assessment will achieve its stated objectives of restoring habitat diversity, while addressing causes rather than symptoms.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

If assessment were needed, a more specific plan to address a smaller subset of issues would be a good starting point.

It seems like this project is dependent on the Clallam River Habitat Assessment study, especially the stream hydrology. Recommend completing inventory and assessment work in upper watershed with implementation of major sediment control and human impact measures before determining course of action at mouth.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Agree that a planning approach is appropriate to this complex issue.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan County/Colville Tribes
Project Sponsor: Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation
Project Name: Fulton Dam Fish Passage Barrier Removal
Project Number: 04-1485R
Project Location: Chewuch River near Winthrop
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

- Provides for threatened spring Chinook, as well as steelhead and bull trout by removing rock dam that serves as partial barrier at certain flows with a roughened channel. While the dam is a partial barrier, it’s obviously not ideal to have it remain in place and as it’s near the confluence with the Methow, likely causes juvenile mortality for most of the Chewuch run.
- The sponsor adequately provided additional information requested by the SRFB Technical Advisors to address their concerns of the project.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Clearly a lot of discussion has occurred between PUD, landowners and fish agencies already regarding this project.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan County/Colville Tribes
Project Sponsor: Okanogan Conservation District
Project Name: Chewuch Basin Riparian Protection
Project Number: 04-1492 A
Project Location:
Project Type: Protection

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan/Colville
Project Sponsor: Colville Confederated Tribes
Project Name: Okanogan R. Thermal & Lidar Image-Phase 2
Project Number: 04-1717N
Project Location: Okanogan watershed
Project Type: Non-capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The sponsor provided additional information to adequately address the SRFB Technical Advisor’s concerns.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan County/Colville Tribes
Project Sponsor: Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation
Project Name: Chewuch Dam Fish Passage Barrier Removal
Project Number: 04-1489R
Project Location: Chewuch River near Winthrop
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

- Provides for threatened spring Chinook, as well as steelhead and bull trout by removing rock dam that serves as a partial barrier at certain flows with a roughened channel.
- The sponsor adequately provided additional information to address the concerns of the SRFB Technical Advisors.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan County/Colville Tribes
Project Sponsor: Okanogan Conservation District
Project Name: Lower Beaver Creek Piping
Project Number: 04-1688R
Project Location: Beaver Creek near Twisp
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would pipe two ditches but unclear if water would be sufficient to prevent downstream dewatering. Benefits appear to be dependent on addressing Fort Thurlow passage barrier, which is scheduled for correction by 2005. The project makes incremental progress towards flow increases.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan/Colville
Project Sponsor: Upper Columbia Regional Fish Enhancement
Project Name: Rockview Diversion
Project Number: 04-1494 R
Project Location: Methow River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan County/Colville Tribes
Project Sponsor: Okanogan Conservation District
Project Name: Maracci Diversion and Piping
Project Number: 04-1301R
Project Location: Beaver Creek near Twisp
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan County/Colville Tribes
Project Sponsor: Upper Columbia RFEG
Project Name: Similkameen River Riparian Habitat Protection
Project Number: 04-1586A
Project Location: Similkameen River near Oroville
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Pacific County
Project Sponsor: Pacific CD
Project Name: Johnson Creek restoration
Project Number: 04-1622R
Project Location: Willapa Bay
Project Type: Assessment

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? No
Why?

Good project

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Work the WDFW engineering on the design concepts and final design.

4. Other comments.

Please see the WDFW review comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity:	Pacific County
Project Sponsor:	Willapa Bay RFEG
Project Name:	Oxbow Creek Construction Phase
Project Number:	04-1627R
Project Location:	Trib to Willapa River
Project Type:	Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Engineering design was completed last grant cycle. Sponsor ready to proceed to construction. Application material well presented.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Please see the WDFW passage review.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Pacific County
Project Sponsor: Sportsmen's National Land Trust
Project Name: Skidmore Slough Acquisition
Project Number: 04-1636C
Project Location: Raymond
Project Type: Acquisition/Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒

Why?

This project is the beginning of a long process of restoration at Skidmore Slough. Though the immediate benefits from this acquisition are low, the sponsor has provided adequate materials and data to show a path to restoration at this site. Additionally, data has been brought forth to clarify the use of the project site by salmonids, albeit limited which greatly improves the benefit of the acquisition.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Continue to develop plans to address the lower tide gates which appears to be the driving influence for the limited salmonid production at Skidmore Slough.

4. Other comments.

The sponsor has reasonable rational for proposing the acquisition of target lands ahead of addressing the tide gate that drives the Skidmore Slough system though in a perfect world the tide gate would be fixed first. The sponsors have provided a schedule for future work via a table outlining their plans for further restoration.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity:	Pacific County
Project Sponsor: (CRA)	Miranda Wecker, Coastal Resources Alliance
Project Name:	Ranking of Estuarine Habitat Restoration
Project Number:	04-1641N
Project Location:	Willapa Bay
Project Type:	Assessment

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Most all the tide gates and associated habitat associated with WSDOT roads have been documented by WDFW through the interagency agreement with WSDOT. Some of these culverts/tide gates are on the 6 year plan for correction. The final product from this study is not clear. Will the sites identified have enough data to become projects, or will further assessment be needed on some sites (example: Skidmore slough)?

4. Other comments.
Please see the Nearshore Review comments.



Lead Entity:	Pacific County
Project Sponsor:	Sportmen's National Land Trust
Project Name:	Willapa River Acquisition and Restoration
Project Number:	04-1645C
Project Location:	Willapa River, Pacific County
Project Type:	Acquisition/Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

--

4. Other comments.

The Technical Advisors review a detailed response from the sponsor. The sponsor has addressed the concerns noted previously which related to project cost relative to the anticipated benefits, it is unclear how the entire project will achieve its stated objective and the sequencing may be wrong. The sponsor provided a 24 page detailed response addressing these concerns.



Lead Entity:	Pacific County
Project Sponsor:	Willapa Bay RFEG
Project Name:	North Stream
Project Number:	04-1650R
Project Location:	Willapa Bay NWR
Project Type:	Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The objective of the project is increase access to areas blocked (1.6 miles) by human-caused impediments, and to restore the Biological important elements of spawning/rearing to about 2 miles of stream. North Stream is in the Willapa National Wildlife Refuge (WNWR), on property recently added to the refuge. WNWR and WBRFEG recently commissioned three studies to evaluate the limiting factors of the new property. These studies show limiting factors of access 100% blocking for Chum, and loss of spawning and rearing for Chum, Coho, and Cutthroat on North Stream.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Please see the WDFW comments. Good project and application well presented



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity:	Pacific County
Project Sponsor:	Shorebank Enterprise Pacific
Project Name:	Bear River Channel Restoration
Project Number:	04-1661R
Project Location:	Bear River, Trib to Willapa Bay
Project Type:	Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

LWD placement in trib to Bear River. Current conditions lack LWD but are not highly degraded. Benefit moderate but priority low.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Pend Oreille**
Project Sponsor: **lone Town of**
Project Name: **Cedar Creek Fish Passage Restoration**
Project Number: **04-1372 R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Last year had concerns about introgression between bull trout/brook trout and west slope cutthroat/rainbow trout, actual use by bull trout and downstream partial barrier, but these appear to have been addressed.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Pend Oreille**
Project Sponsor: **Pend Oreille Conservation Dist**
Project Name: **Priest Basin Barrier Assessment**
Project Number: **04-1480 N**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Identify passage barriers with PI’s in tributaries to the Priest River, which supports threatened adfluvial bull trout as well as westslope cutthroat trout. Nearly half of the survey would be conducted on basins that only support relatively isolated populations of westslope cutthroat trout. The top 5 projects would have prelim designs. Project has a high likelihood of identifying projects of significant benefit to these native fish.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comment



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Pend Oreille**
Project Sponsor: **Pend Oreille Conservation Dist**
Project Name: **Indian Creek Diversion Screening**
Project Number: **04-1373 R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Would improve diversion site to improve fish passage for bull trout and add some flow from changing to pipe conveyance, although unclear how significant this is. Somewhat dependent upon the completion of two other proposed barrier removal sites. The benefits are probably low because it doesn’t seem to be a significant problem currently and other issues are more likely impacting use by bull trout. The proposed designs should get some further expert scrutiny.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The probability of brook trout in the system should be addressed in the project proposal because it is likely a major threat to bull trout recovery. It would also be helpful for this proposal to mention any future projects (if any) are planned in Indian Creek.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Pierce County**
Project Sponsor: **Cascade Land Conservancy**
Project Name: **S. Prairie Creek Acquisition Restoration**
Project Number: **04-1687 C**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Combination**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The Technical Advisors recommend that the sponsor and its partners consider in-stream and bank/floodplain restoration as needed to improve channel conditions and floodplain connection within the Inglin Farm Reach of South Prairie Creek. Further reach assessment, in addition to the flooding and channel migration zone studies being performed by Pierce County may be needed to assess need and construction alternatives. If future instream and bank work is warranted it would be appropriate to plan access routes within the planting area for heavy equipment to access the stream. These actions may also serve to help restore fish access to Tributary 2.

A good example of this issue is the waste storage tank from the dairy. The Technical Advisors would recommend removing this completely from the historically active channel and floodplain if not cost prohibitive. Long-term planning should consider the need to remove the existing access bridge and other structures in the riparian zone and floodplain if possible.

4. Other comments.

Good match with several partners. The Technical Advisors would like to thank the sponsor for providing the maps, aerial photos, restoration plan, and detailed responses to our questions.



Lead Entity: **Pierce County**
Project Sponsor: **South Puget Sound SEG**
Project Name: **Electron Fish Screen Feasibility Project**
Project Number: **04-1476 N**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

This feasibility study will identify alternatives that will dramatically increase smolt survival of fish that enter the forebay and flume. Several options will be addressed and probable construction costs will be developed for each action. upper 26 miles of habitat for Chinook, steelhead, coho, and char. While the site is a high priority area that would benefit salmon, many uncertainties exist about implementing a solution. The alternatives being evaluated should consider the eventual probability of channel avulsion around the diversion dam. Old side channels are located on the adjacent floodplain and coupled with the recent road washout indicate a propensity for near-term channel migration. If a channel avulsion occurred, what are the chances that the diversion dam would cease to be used?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

--

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

--

4. Other comments.

--



Lead Entity: **Pierce County**
Project Sponsor: **Pierce Co Water Programs Div**
Project Name: **Levee Setback Feasibility Study**
Project Number: **04-1216 N**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

Excellent concept.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The technical advisors suggested that the sponsor eliminate the Terrian Visualization Video if it is not a critical part of informing landowners and others of a future levee setback project.

4. Other comments.

Originally considered a project of concern. Sponsor provided a detailed task description and a cost breakdown. This addressed the Technical Advisors concerns.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Pierce County**
Project Sponsor: **South Puget Sound SEG**
Project Name: **Nearshore Restoration Design Project**
Project Number: **04-1478 N**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project has a high cost relative to anticipated benefits and there are significant constraints to the implementation of high priority projects.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Are there assurances that these projects can be implemented?
Another, more cost effective approach is to select one or two potential sites and do feasibility and designs for those sites.

4. Other comments.

Initial comments for POC included cost/benefit and implementation of future projects. Nearshore report had no significant concerns. It would appear the decisions made on this project to warrant the POC label were based on an incomplete understanding of the project. This proposal is in keeping with adjacent WRIAs in an attempt to have a consistent nearshore response to project identification and design. Costs are higher in this proposal because Pierce County has to conduct both an assessment of nearshore conditions and a project identification and design project whereas adjacent WRIA’s have already

conducted the assessment portion. While there may still be areas where work can be trimmed back and still retain adequate understanding of the nearshore to provide decision makers with appropriate projects to design it is overall a thoughtful and complete assessment project. Historical information is not currently available in the project area but if provided the project will not duplicate efforts. Since the project will result in design of projects and not construction, it is unfair to suggest that implementation of construction is unlikely. Enough coordination between the lead entities and BNSF has occurred to make future projects likely. Suggest the POC be removed.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Pierce County**
Project Sponsor: **King County DNR & Parks**
Project Name: **Lower Boise Creek Design**
Project Number: **04-1467 N**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The Lower Boise Creek Design project seeks to design a project to restore channel, floodplain, and riparian conditions at the mouth of Boise Creek, a right-bank tributary to the White. Benefits chinook coho, steelhead, and bull trout. The project would design the relocation of the lowest 500 feet of channel into newly constructed channel approximately 1200 feet in length. Adjacent road and railroad constrained channel, but now removed. Uncertain about whether there will be an impact or extent of impact from potential headcutting. 700 feet of additional habitat is good benefit, but not certain that moving creek over new pipe alignment is a good idea in the long term.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Cost of design seems high considering King County owns the property and the project is for design only of a 1500 foot new channel. LE correct to rank this as a low priority. Urgency not demonstrated.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Quinault Nation**
Project Sponsor: **Fish & Wildlife Dept of**
Project Name: **Shale Creek Fish Passage Project**
Project Number: **04-1498 R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? NO
Why?

Great project and cost effective.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Please see the WDFW Review comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Quinault Nation**
Project Sponsor: **Quinault Indian Nation**
Project Name: **F-15 Road Culverts**
Project Number: **04-1704 R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

There seems to be a heavy focus on adding rock weirs and riprap. Are these necessary?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The cost estimates for bridges of this size seem very low. Further explanation would be helpful.

4. Other comments.

Please see the WDFW review comments.

It would have been very helpful for the sponsor to provide better information in the application or requested assistance from WDFW to prepare the cost estimates and design options. These are good projects and will provide a high benefit to fish when completed. In the future it is recommended that the sponsor spend more effort to pull together the necessary information.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Quinault Nation**

Project Sponsor: **Natural Resources Dept of**

Project Name: **Mule Creek Barrier Replacement Too**

Project Number: **04-1702 R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **YES**

Why?

Project is ineligible for SRFB funding.

RCW 75.46.170 (8) was passed into law in 2000, through Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2589, which states:

"The board may award a grant or loan for a salmon recovery project on private or public land when the landowner has a legal obligation under local, state or federal law to perform the project, when expedited action provides a clear benefit to salmon recovery, and there will be harm to salmon recovery if the project is delayed. For purposes of this subsection, a legal obligation does not include a project required solely as a mitigation or condition of permitting. "

This law provided the SRFB with the authority to fund or not fund projects covered under an existing law...such as fish passage, screens, diversions, etc.

In response to the above law, the SRFB on June 15, 2001 and again on December 5, 2003, declared by policy that "silvicultural treatments and other forest practices" means all activities covered by the Forest & Fish Program and the Forest Practices Act, RCW 76.09. What this means is that the SRFB will not fund fish passage projects (culverts) on lands covered by Forest and Fish requirements. Nor will the SRFB pay forest landowners to harvest their trees....pre-commercial and commercial thinning in riparian areas as a means to accelerate the growth of the residual trees.

All fish passage work on all non-Forest & Fish land is addressed in Manual 18e, "In-Stream Passage."

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

--

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

--

4. Other comments.

--



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Quinault Nation**
Project Sponsor: **Quinault Indian Nation**
Project Name: **QIN Sediment Del & Fish Passage Assmt**
Project Number: **04-1696 N**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **YES**
Why?

The information provided is not sufficient to determine the benefit of the project.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

If the project would have focused on inventorying and prioritizing fish passage barriers and followed the guidelines provided in SRFB Manual 18d section 14e WDFW Guidelines Fish Barrier Inventories the project would have been technically sound.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The technical advisors encourage the sponsor to reapply next round and focus the project on completing a comprehensive barrier for the WRIA. The WDFW Technical Applications Program is available to provide assistance and crew training to develop a quality project.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Quinault Nation**
Project Sponsor: **Pacific Coast Salmon Coalition**
Project Name: **July Creek Culvert Replacement**
Project Number: **04-1703 R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **No**
Why?

Good project and likely a good benefit for fish. However, the application was missing the evaluation proposal. The Barrier Evaluation Forms were useful in understanding the scope of the project

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The sponsor needs to explain in greater detail why \$100K is needed for a bypass bridge?

4. Other comments.



Lead Entity: **Quinault Nation**
Project Sponsor: **Pacific Coast Salmon Coalition**
Project Name: **Higley Creek Culverts Replacement**
Project Number: **04-1710 R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

Good project and likely high benefit for fish. However, the application was missing the evaluation proposal. The Barrier Evaluation Forms were useful in understanding the scope of the project

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **San Juan Co CD**

Project Sponsor: **Friends of the San Juans**

Project Name: **Mud Bay Shoreline Softening**

Project Number: **04-1657 N**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The applicant has addressed all the initial concerns. The project proposal has changed from a restoration project to a feasibility and design project. To maximize the forage fish habitat benefit requires the relocation of the county road and the removal and/or softening of bulkheads along adjacent private property.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **San Juan Co CD**

Project Sponsor: **Friends of the San Juans**

Project Name: **Assessment of Eelgrass Restoration**

Project Number: **04-1697 N**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

Although this assessment contains a “pilot” restoration component, without fully understanding the reasons for the decline of eelgrass in Wescott Bay, the team feels that a concurrent approach performing both restoration and assessment is a particularly effective proposal in this situation. The project is likely to achieve its stated objectives.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **San Juan Co CD**

Project Sponsor: **Samish Nation**

Project Name: **Juvenile Salmon Nearshore Utilization**

Project Number: **04-1552 N**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

It is clear that this project can meet its objectives, and that it is directly relevant to project and strategy development. This project is proposed to be coordinated with the #1 ranked multi-LE assessment, led by the Skagit River System Cooperative. The information generated from this juvenile salmon nearshore utilization assessment will be incorporated into the San Juan Islands salmon habitat recovery strategy.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Skagit**

Project Sponsor: **SRSC**

Project Name: **Milltown Island Estuarine Habitat Restoration**

Project Number: **04-1620R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The project area is currently influenced by tides, but remnant levee system limits channel development. Removal of additional fill and revegetation on about 212 acres should provide significant benefits to salmon (particularly Chinook) by restoring critical estuarine habitat.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Skagit**

Project Sponsor: **The Nature Conservancy**

Project Name: **Fisher Slough Acquisition & Feasibility**

Project Number: **04-1624P**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Assessment**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project applicant addressed all initial concerns. This project will serve as an important demonstration project for conducting salmon restoration on diked agricultural land.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Skagit**

Project Sponsor: **Skagit River System Cooperative**

Project Name: **McGlinn Island Causeway**

Project Number: **04-1625N**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Assessment**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project has a high likelihood of eventually providing important benefits to salmon (particularly Chinook) by restoring access to hundreds if not thousands of acres of critical estuarine habitat. The assessment is necessary to assess the feasibility and design of good restoration projects in this complex area.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Skagit**

Project Sponsor: **Seattle City Light**

Project Name: **Hoy Riparian Restoration Project**

Project Number: **04-1655C**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The riparian revegetation project and livestock fencing covers 2 miles and 34 acres on the south side of Skagit River and would help to protect the habitat in this area with high use by fall chinook and steelhead for spawning as well as pink and chums. Bank erosion is significant from cattle grazing and vegetation removal, so fencing and replanting should have a high certainty of success.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Skagit**

Project Sponsor: **Ducks Unlimited**

Project Name: **Swinomish Channel Restoration**

Project Number: **04-1626R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project will restore 1.5 miles of channel and 200 acres of estuarine marshlands by removing and breaching levees, excavating existing oxbow (to help restore and reconnect old channel) and constructing setback levees. The project has a high likelihood of providing important benefits to salmon (particularly Chinook) by restoring critical estuarine habitat. The proposed work is relatively straightforward and has a high certainty of success.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?
4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Skagit**

Project Sponsor: **WDFW**

Project Name: **Rawlins Road Estuary Feasibility**

Project Number: **04-1640N**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Assessment**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project will assess the feasibility of restoring critical estuarine habitat involving private landowners. While the certainty of success is unknown since little work has been done with these landowners, the potential benefits are very high. The minimal cost for exploring restoration options and the potentially high rewards make this a worthwhile effort.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

It’s a great opportunity to pull in landowners who haven’t been engaged in habitat restoration. Project could lead to other opportunities with the agricultural community.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Skagit**

Project Sponsor: **Skagit Conservation District**

Project Name: **Cascades Road Erosion Control**

Project Number: **04-1638R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project has a high certainty of success in reducing sediment inputs to the Cascade River by upgrading roads to current standards, stabilizing fills, and decommissioning roads. The project would benefit chinook, coho, steelhead, and char in the Cascade River.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Skagit**

Project Sponsor: **SRSC**

Project Name: **Gilligan's Island Dike Removal**

Project Number: **04-1629R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project applicant has addressed all initial concerns. The project is likely to have a high benefit to salmon by removing 580 feet of dike and restoring natural bank conditions allowing for more natural channel processes in this reach.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Skagit**

Project Sponsor: **SFEG**

Project Name: **Skagit Fish Passage Improvement**

Project Number: **04-1653R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Passage**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project is a combination of habitat inventory, passage design, and implementation of three of the highest priority barriers (potentially including side channels and sloughs). The project is likely to have a high benefit to salmon, although the benefit does depend on which three projects are feasible with the given amount of funding.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Filtering the list of 100+ projects down to the 30 highest priorities should be done with minimal effort relying on map information and the professional judgments of local biologists.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Skagit Watershed Council**

Project Sponsor: **Skagit County Public Works**

Project Name: **Hansen Creek Design and Permitting**

Project Number: **04-1635 N**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project sponsor has provided further justification regarding the costs for permitting and design work of specific project elements.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Skagit**

Project Sponsor: **SFEG**

Project Name: **Ennis Creek Acquisition and Restoration**

Project Number: **04-1646R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Acquisition and Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project would primarily benefit coho (in a major production area), and possibly steelhead and char as well. The project would reconstruct the historical channel across Innis Ck road for 600 feet into the Samish R within a 50-acre parcel acquired by the Whatcom Land Trust, that includes riparian and floodplain habitat along Samish River. The project is addressing a clear problem with the current channel location along the road and protects the biologically important confluence between Ennis Creek and the Samish River.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Some uncertainty exists about the crossing structure but working with Whatcom County to determine what type of road crossing to provide (i.e., bridge, box culvert) and the County would pay entirely for structure.

See additional comments in "04-1646 Ennis WDFW Barrier Evaluation" file.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Skagit**

Project Sponsor: **SFEG**

Project Name: **NP Creek Passage Improvement**

Project Number: **04-1654R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Fish Passage**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project replaces a bridge and removes concrete apron to improve passage that primarily benefits coho and will open about 1.5 miles of good quality spawning and rearing habitat (PI=16.8). Using rock weirs to address grade differences. This relatively straightforward project has a high certainty of success.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Skagit**

Project Sponsor: **Skagit Land Trust**

Project Name: **Wiseman Creek-Minkler Lake Protection**

Project Number: **04-1632A**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Acquisition**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **YES**
Why?

There currently is no clearly defined proposal for restoring salmon habitat on Parcel No. 1, which makes it difficult to determine whether the stewardship plan is sufficient to meet the goal of salmon habitat restoration. Because of this, the acquisition may be in the wrong sequence.

For Parcel No. 2, existing federal, state, and local wetland protection requirements already protect salmon habitat features of this site, indicating that there is a low threat to habitat conditions if the parcel is not acquired.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

Applicant needs to identify a definite habitat restoration plan for Parcel No. 1 and demonstration of specific threats to priority salmon habitat conditions on Parcel No. 2.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

--

4. Other comments.

This project would be strengthened as a combination project, by adding the preferred restoration alternative identified in the final Wiseman Creek Feasibility Study (#00-1735N) to be completed next year.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Snake River**
Project Sponsor: **Walla Walla County of**
Project Name: **Walla Walla /Spring Branch Hab As**
Project Number: **04-1604 N**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? No
Why?

The sponsor has addressed the concerns of the SRFB Technical Advisors and made changes to the project to ensure the assessment will lead to beneficial projects in priority areas. The sponsor has outlined the tasks to be implemented, including developing a list of priority habitat restoration actions.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Snake River
Project Sponsor: Walla Walla County CD
Project Name: Gose Street Fish Passage Project
Project Number: 04-1605 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Passage

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? No
Why?

The sponsor has addressed the concerns of the SRFB Technical Advisors .

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Use channel weirs, which have a higher probability of success, anchored into the bed such as concrete, or consider a pool and chute fishway built within the channel to take up the drop. WDFW can lend design assistance if so desired by the project sponsor. The conceptual design at this level should include a stream profile to identify the overall drop. Other alternatives to fish passage should be presented that would better address the certainty of success. The proposal could also be improved by describing other ongoing and proposed restoration activities upstream such as the low-flow channel being discussed by the watershed group.

4. Other comments.

In completing the project, it is important to note the high amount of energy the project will experience just downstream end of the flood control channel.

Passage at Gose Street is a key component in restoring salmonids in the Mill Creek drainage. The project is further supported by numerous partners contributing to the implementation. It is also the 1st in the sequence of projects above the confluence of the Walla Walla River. The project needs to include Ben Tice’s latest report on fish counts at the Bennington Dam to show bull trout, steelhead, and Chinook are actively using Mill Creek for migration in numbers above what was previously suggested.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Snake River**

Project Sponsor: **Walla Walla Co Cons Dist**

Project Name: **Hofer Dam Fish Passage Project - Phase 1**

Project Number: **04-1606 N**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Sponsor already has a conceptual design completed and is requesting a high dollar amount to take the project to 90% design. Improvements to the diversion dam could lead to significant benefits by addressing a partial barrier to adult and juvenile steelhead, Chinook, and bull trout. It is unclear why this work would not be covered under A&E of Phase 2 construction money and why Phase 1 work to date is insufficient. Project is dependent upon a significant amount of other money (several million dollars) to fix the barrier.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Snake River**

Project Sponsor: **Tri-State Steelheaders Inc**

Project Name: **Kooskooskie Dam Fish Passage Enhancement**

Project Number: **04-1379 R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The sponsor has addressed the concerns of the SRFB Technical Advisors .

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Removal of the dam (partial or complete) would be the preferred alternative. Dam removal will eliminate height and velocity barriers, increasing the availability of the upper Mill Creek watershed to spawning and rearing by steelhead, bull trout, and spring Chinook. In addition to dam modification, this project will create in-stream habitat and rehabilitate adjacent riparian habitat. It is a partial barrier for adults, as Chinook, steelhead and bull trout have spawned upstream of the dam and probably a full barrier to juveniles.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Snake River**

Project Sponsor: **Pomeroy Conservation Dist**

Project Name: **Garfield County Irrigation Screening Pro**

Project Number: **04-1568 R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

This proposal identifies and cost shares for the installation of 30 screens located throughout Garfield County on the Pataha, Deadman, Meadow, and Alpowa Creeks that could benefit threatened summer steelhead. The project is likely to provide benefits but difficult to quantify how significant the benefit will be without more information about the locations of the screens. Provide information and details on prioritization system.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Snake River**
Project Sponsor: **Tri-State Steelheaders Inc**
Project Name: **N.Fk. Coppei Creek Conservation Easement**
Project Number: **04-1539 A**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Acquisition**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project sponsor has reduced the funding request to purchase a 150-foot riparian easement on a spring-fed tributary to North Fork Coppei Creek. While the tributary probably has only localized influence on stream temperatures within the NF Coppei Creek (the spring provides approximately 5% of the total flow of NF Coppei during August), the fact that juvenile steelhead have been found within the tributary indicates that this area could serve as thermal refuge and provide direct benefit to threatened steelhead.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Snake River**

Project Sponsor: **Columbia Conservation Dist**

Project Name: **Tucannon River Sediment Intrusion Assess**

Project Number: **04-1611 N**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why?

We appreciate the information that baseline data from the 1980’s can be used to measure changes in fine sediment levels, but we still have significant concerns about the small sample size relative to the variability in the percent fines at a site or reach level, and the inability of this assessment to diagnose the cause of sediment problems. The data developed from this project is unlikely to clearly lead to beneficial projects.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Snake River**

Project Sponsor: **Blue Mountain Land Trust**

Project Name: **Assess of Landowner Interest in Cons Eas**

Project Number: **04-1617 N**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project sponsor has altered the proposal to focus on the highest priority reaches within the Snake River lead entity and to increase interaction with local experts to prioritize future potential projects using specified criteria. The assessment is likely to lead to projects that would protect and significantly benefit threatened salmonid stocks.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Snake River**

Project Sponsor: **Asotin County Conservation District**

Project Name: **Snake River Region Habitat Data Management**

Project Number: 04-1613N

Project Location:

Project Type: **Non-Capital**

PROJECT IS INELIGIBLE

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y N
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

PROJECT IS INELIGIBLE

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Snake River**
Project Sponsor: **Blue Mountain Land Trust**
Project Name: **Touchet River Conservation Easement**
Project Number: **04-1619 A**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Acquisition**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

Y ☐ N ☒

Why?

The proposed project site appears to be decent CREP protected streamside habitat surrounded by farmland along 2 miles of the Lower Touchet used by steelhead and Chinook. The conservation easement will protect the riparian area in perpetuity. The sponsor responded to the Technical Advisor's comments. Most of the protected area is in the floodplain of the Touchet River. The easement will be based on Fair Market Value. The easement will protect the property from development and agricultural use by purchasing the rights for development and agriculture.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Snake River**
Project Sponsor: **Blue Mountain RC&D**
Project Name: **Ski Bluewood Parking Lot**
Project Number: **04-1621 R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why?

The map of water sample locations was helpful, but we still have a number of concerns about this project that were detailed in previous comments. The project is likely to have limited benefits to salmonids and has a high cost relative to benefits.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Snohomish**
Project Sponsor: **Ducks Unlimited - Vancouver**
Project Name: **Spencer Island Estuary Restoration**
Project Number: **04-1585 R**
Project Location: **Snohomish River Delta**
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The new trail spurs may alter how saltwater flows out the system, altering the way tidal channels are formed. A detailed review of the trail spurs seems appropriate.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: Tulalip Tribes
Project Name: Qwuloolt Estuary Restoration Phase 2
Project Number: 04-1587 N
Project Location: Snohomish Delta
Project Type: Assessment

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria?
Why?

No

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

See nearshore review comments below.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: King County DNR and Parks
Project Name: Lower Tolt River Floodplain Reconnection
Project Number: 04-1596 R
Project Location: Tolt River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish

Project Sponsor: Snohomish County DPW

Project Name: Smith Island Estuary Restoration and Acquisition

Project Number: 04-1572

Project Location: Snohomish Delta

Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: King County DNR
Project Name: Raging River Preston Reach Levee Removal
Project Number: 04-1597
Project Location: Raging River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: Cascade Land Conservancy
Project Name: Snohomish Confluence Acquisition and Restoration
Project Number: 04-1595 C
Project Location: Snohomish River
Project Type: Acquisition and Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: Washington Trout
Project Name: Cherry Creek Floodplain Restoration
Project Number: 04-1574
Project Location: Cherry Creek / Snoqualmie River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

This potentially could be a very worthwhile project for demonstrating that drainage district interests and salmon habitat restoration need not be mutually exclusive.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: Tulalip Tribe
Project Name: Alpine Baldy Road Decommissioning
Project Number: 04-1599
Project Location: MBSNF / USFS Roads No.6066 and 6067
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

The proposal appears sound, however, a more detailed description of the project design and how it will be implemented would be useful. Include such factors as soil conditions, number of culverts to be removed or upgraded, how the mass wasting area will be dealt with, construction BMPs, etc.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: Seattle City Light
Project Name: South Fork Tolt LWD Placement
Project Number: 04-1598
Project Location: Tolt River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: NW Chinook Recovery, Inc.
Project Name: Groeneveld Slough Restoration
Project Number: 04-1600
Project Location: Skykomish River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? No
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Though this project has been removed from the project of concern list, there are still some design concerns that should be addressed by the sponsor should the project be funded. See below.

- It is not clear that the “porous LWD weir” at the upstream end will meter flows into the slough, or why its desirable to meter flows at all. This technique is usually used with existing active side channels.
- The riprap grade control structures that are intended to back-water low summer flows are probably counter-productive to the natural development of the channel. Grade controls are most appropriate in side channels to maintain a minimum water depth when there is significant groundwater flow. Thus, the proponent should study groundwater/hyporheic flow in the slough before fixing on these grade controls. It may be preferable to leave out the grade controls and just let the slough headcut up from the downstream end to gradually deepen the channel, rather than relying on constructed pools.
- We suspect that the main reason for one of the grade controls is to provide a rock-filled ford for access to the other side. In this case, perhaps a railcar bridge or some other kind of crossing would be more appropriate.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: Snohomish Conservation District
Project Name: Riley Slough Restoration Feasibility Study
Project Number: 04-1614N
Project Location: Skykomish River
Project Type: Feasibility Study

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: Ducks Unlimited
Project Name: Eagle Perch Wetland Restoration
Project Number:
Project Location: Snoqualmie River
Project Type: Restoration

SPONSOR HAS WITHDRAWN THIS PROJECT

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **Yes**
Why?

It is unclear whether converting this pasture to a wetland has significant benefit to salmon.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The plan for fish access and egress from the restoration area needs to be further developed. Despite construction of a new channel in the interior of the site, fish passage from the river remains in a drainage ditch that is shared with other property owners. The plan of allowing the landowner to set the level of the water control structures seems tenuous. We suggest the proponent consider using a roughened channel instead of a pool and weir-type water control structure.

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Stillaguamish**
Project Sponsor: **Ducks Unlimited**
Project Name: **Leque Island Estuary Assessment**
Project Number: **04-1651R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Estuary Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Stillaguamish**
Project Sponsor: **Stillaguamish Tribe**
Project Name: **Steelhead Haven Landslide Remediation**
Project Number: 04-1634R
Project Location: N. Fork Stillaguamish
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The proponents should be aware that in the opinion of at least one technical advisor, a significant weakness of this project is that it does not correct - but merely responds to – a key landscape process limitation, which is the inability of the river meander to migrate downstream due to bank armoring upstream of the site. A more logical sequencing for habitat restoration in this reach would be to remove the bank armoring and then protect the toe of the landslide. Nevertheless, since the proponents apparently have decided that removal of the bank armoring is politically infeasible and that protection of the toe of the slide is their next best alternative, they should be prepared to make this argument as convincing as possible.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Stillaguamish Lead Entity
Project Sponsor: Stillaguamish Indian Tribe
Project Name: South Fork Riparian Restoration Crew
Project Number: 04-1633R
Project Location:
Project Type: Riparian Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?

NO

Why?

The South Fork Riparian Project is an attempt to provide atleast 50,000 riparian plantings along private and public lands. The objective is to jumpstart recolonization and LWD sources to the river.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Stillaguamish**
Project Sponsor: **Stillaguamish Indian Tribe**
Project Name: **Hazel Hole ELJ**
Project Number: **04-1642R**
Project Location: N.Fork Stillaguamish
Project Type: In-Stream Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Stillaguamish Lead Entity
Project Sponsor: Cascade Land Conservancy
Project Name: Riverscene Park
Project Number: 04-1615C
Project Location: Combination

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

The purpose here is to acquire a riverside parcel near Riverscene Park. The area is under heavy development pressure and the existing parcel for sale is in good shape with great understory and mature coniferous trees. A small project component is to plant trees in certain areas. The parcels are currently for sale.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Stillaguamish**
Project Sponsor: **Stillaguamish Indian Tribe**
Project Name: **NF Stilly Stream Temperature Reduction**
Project Number: **04-1643 R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Stillaguamish Lead Entity
Project Sponsor: Snohomish County SWM
Project Name: Sediment Abatement Assessment
Project Number: 04-1618N
Project Location: Stilly basin
Project Type: Assessment

SPONSOR HAS WITHDRAWN THIS PROJECT

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria?
Why?

YES

More information is needed to determine whether methodology will meet objectives and serve as a basis for future project prioritization. Given the hydrologic characteristics of the river, it would seem difficult to come to conclusions about priority sites when the largest sources of sediment input are still active. It is primarily a sequencing concern.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

With the largest sources of documented concern still active, I question whether this work would be most useful to prioritize other erosion control projects. With the slides active, more information on how the influence of these sources will be isolated from other sediment sources and used to develop a useful priority system would be needed.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The experimental design looks good for the North Fork but the ability to bracket major sediment sources on the South Fork isn't as clear. The need for the data by restoration practitioners was unclear.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Stillaguamish**
Project Sponsor: **Snohomish Co Conservation Dist**
Project Name: **Segelsen Road Erosion Control**
Project Number: **04-1644 R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Stillaguamish**
Project Sponsor: **Tulalip Tribe**
Project Name: **Stillaguamish River Intertidal Enhancement**
Project Number: **04-1616R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Thurston County CD**
Project Sponsor: **South Puget Sound SEG**
Project Name: **WRIA 13 Nearshore Restoration Design Pro**
Project Number: **04-1389 N**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Please see the Nearshore comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Thurston County CD**
Project Sponsor: **Thurston Regional Plng Council**
Project Name: **Deschutes River Estuary Rest. Study**
Project Number: **04-1439 N**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The sponsor provided a detailed response that addresses the technical panels

4. Other comments.

The application was very well presented and supporting materials very helpful in understanding the project.

Nearshore comments were generally approving and this proposal represents a biological and physical data collection effort in support of a decision that would determine the future direction of the Deschutes estuary. This is not a construction project and the evaluation should not include discussion of whether construction is likely to occur. The question is whether the restoration study will accomplish its goal given the data provided and the people proposing the work. In both cases it appears the results will be valid and inform the decision making process on this potentially large and beneficial project.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: **Thurston County CD**
Project Sponsor: **South Puget Sound SEG**
Project Name: **Green Cove Creek Fish Passage Project**
Project Number: **04-1386 R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

Great project but high cost

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Application and supporting material well presented.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Thurston County CD**

Project Sponsor: **WA Trout**

Project Name: **Cooper/Johnson Point Watertype Assess.**

Project Number: **04-1453 N**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Excellent concept and great proposal. This is the type of assessment work that should be completed in every lead entity area.



Lead Entity: **Thurston County CD**
Project Sponsor: **South Puget Sound SEG**
Project Name: **Adams Creek Fish Passage Project**
Project Number: **04-1387 R**
Project Location:
Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Whatcom County**

Project Sponsor: **Whatcom Land Trust**

Project Name: **South Fork Crown**

Project Number: **04-1610 A**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Acquisition**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

This acquisition would protect about 7.75 miles of forested riparian and floodplain habitat for all salmonid species, and in particular critical Chinook spawning habitat. This is in the highest priority reach in the highest priority geographic area with WRIA #1.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Whatcom County**

Project Sponsor: **Lummi Indian Business Council**

Project Name: **Upper South Fork Project Development**

Project Number: **04-1487 N**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

The project applicant has addresses all concerns. This proposal complements the South Fork Crown project (04-1610A).

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Whatcom – WRIA 1**

Project Sponsor: **Nooksack Tribe Natural Resources**

Project Name: **NF Nooksack Restoration Feasibility**

Project Number: **04-1628N**

Project Location: **North Fork Nooksack River**

Project Type: **Assessment**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The proposed assessment of habitat conditions in the North Fork Nooksack River clearly addresses a priority area with critical habitat for Chinook, but the area also has significant channel instability. The assessment would lead to at least one project-ready design for a site. While the reach has a great deal of channel migration that could endanger projects in the long-term, projects will be designed to help protect critical off-channel habitats in the short-term.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Whatcom – WRIA 1**

Project Sponsor: **Port of Bellingham**

Project Name: **Squalicum Waterway Restoration**

Project Number: **04-1491N**

Project Location: **Bellingham**

Project Type: **Assessment**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **YES**

Why?

The proposed project is for the design and permitting of redevelopment work along the estuary of Squalicum Creek. The project would provide some positive benefits to the nearshore marine environment, but the relatively small area with significant bank hardening nearby would most likely limit the benefits to fish from the Squalicum Creek system. Given the significant costs of restoration (several million dollars) and the uncertainty about which restoration option will be chosen, the anticipated benefits seem low.

The redevelopment of this area of the Port seems to place significant constraints on whether the most beneficial salmon habitat restoration project will be implemented upon completion of the feasibility.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Whatcom – WRIA 1**

Project Sponsor: **Nooksack Salmon Enhancement Association**

Project Name: **Nooksack Fish Passage Improvement**

Project Number: **04-1431N**

Project Location: **Whatcom County**

Project Type: **Assessment**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

This assessment would help to engineer passage structures for ten of the highest priority stream crossings in the WRIA. The assessment is likely to lead to projects of significant benefit, although it is difficult to quantify the benefits and the benefits are likely to be primarily for coho.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **Yakama Nation**

Project Name: **Holmes Floodplain Property Protection**

Project Number: **04-1680 A**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Acquisition**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?

NO

Why?

This 50 acre, 2400’ side channel acquisition along the Yakima River is addressing a priority limiting factor in a priority area. The surface water right, totaling 3.31 cubic feet per second and 677 acre feet per year will be managed for instream flow restoration upon acquisition.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **MountainStar ConservationTrust**

Project Name: **Upper Yakima River Easton Reach**

Project Number: **04-1679 A**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Acquisition**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?

NO

Why?

The mature riparian forest within this ~23 acre parcel along the Upper Yakima protects a priority habitat in a priority area, and addresses the priority species.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **MountainStar Conservation Trust**

Project Name: **NF Teanaway River Floodplain - Phase 1**

Project Number: **04-1672 A**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Acquisition**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **Kittitas Co Conservation Dist**

Project Name: **YTAHP Lower Reecer Creek Fish Passage**

Project Number: **04-1675 R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The information provided is not sufficient to determine the benefit of the project, and it is unclear how the project will achieve its stated objective.

The project sponsor has provided additional information on the proposed design and construction of water diversions and screens on lower Reecer Creek. The project should reduce mortality and provide/improve passage for all life history stages of anadromous fish. This project will have significant benefits for threatened chinook and steelhead.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **Meadow Springs Country Club**

Project Name: **West Fork Amon Creek Fish Passage**

Project Number: **04-1693 R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

YES

The project sponsor has proposed reducing the SRFB funding request, but as stated in previous comments below, the project provides minimal benefits to lower priority coho salmon. Despite the smaller funding request, this project still has high cost relative to its benefits to salmon.

While the removal of barriers is a good benefit to primarily coho and steelhead, the costs for the project are high relative to its benefits to fish. The spring fed system probably had limited floodplain historically and proposed dredging of reservoirs will not significantly improve water quality. Runoff from golf course and surrounding urban development appear to be more significant water quality concerns. Overall, this creek system provides a limited quantity and aside from cool water temperatures, provides low quality habitat for salmon.

From a technical perspective this project still provides low benefits for fish. This watershed does not appear to have much habitat, is not a high rated area for

restoration because of several limitations in this urban setting, and is probably of limited value as thermal refuge for Yakima River salmonids.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

The amount of match is not a criterion we evaluate. While community support is a key criterion for the local citizen's group, it's not clear how this project builds community support for salmon restoration in areas that would provide high benefit. Why is this type of public support critical for developing future restoration projects? Is the urban community a priority constituency versus agricultural interests?



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **Fish & Wildlife Dept of**

Project Name: **SF Cowiche Creek Protection**

Project Number: **04-1691 A**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Acquisition**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?

NO

Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **Kittitas Co Conservation Dist**

Project Name: **YTAHP Wilson Creek Riparian Restoration**

Project Number: **04-1676 R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

The applicant addressed all the initial concerns. This riparian planting technique has been used successfully by the Yakama Nation and reduces the maintenance requirements and increases the certainty of plant survival.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **Brunson, Jeff**

Project Name: **Brunson Wilson Creek Flow & Riparian**

Project Number: **04-1690 R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

The applicant has addressed all initial concerns. This project should greatly reduce the sediment delivery to Wilson Creek from existing irrigation ditches.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **Kittitas Co Conservation Dist**

Project Name: **YTAHP Project Cherry Creek Fish Passage**

Project Number: **04-1673 R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The information provided is not sufficient to determine the benefit of the project, it is unclear how the project will achieve its stated objective and the project has a high cost relative to the benefits.

The project sponsor has provided a great deal more information on the potential design and implementation. The project would provide passage for threatened chinook and steelhead to approximately 0.5 miles of habitat, screen a water diversion, and improve riparian conditions along Cherry Creek. Addressing upstream diversions in the future would increase habitat access significantly. The costs are relatively high for opening minimal amounts of habitat, but overall the project will have important benefits to threatened salmon stocks.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

--

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

--

4. Other comments.

--



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **North Yakima Conservation Dist**

Project Name: **Taylor Ditch Phase I Diversion Structure**

Project Number: **04-1682 R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

YES

The benefits of this project are limited to the relative cost. The amount of impact from maintenance of the wing dam does not appear to be significant. It’s not clear why this project is a necessary lead to opening Taylor ditch into a functioning side channel?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

The team recommends finalizing plans for restoration of Taylor ditch into side-channel habitat and including these proposed improvements as part of a larger proposal.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **Kennewick Irrigation District**

Project Name: **Engineered Streams for Salmonid Recovery**

Project Number: **04-1685 R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?

YES

Why?

This project consists of an engineered stream with construction of a new side channel containing habitat features critical to juvenile salmonids. This is not a significant salmon stream and the project does not appear to provide significant benefits to salmon. The proposal does not work with “natural processes” and it’s not clear sufficient water would be present to support off-channel habitat. The team received very limited information on conceptual design and proposed sites.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The \$51K budget item for a 10 foot paved trail is not eligible in our restoration program and has been removed from the proposal.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **Kennewick City of**

Project Name: **Lower Amon Creek Culvert Replacement**

Project Number: **04-1709 R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?

YES

Why?

The information provided is not sufficient to determine the need for, or the benefit of the project. It’s difficult to evaluate the technical aspects of the project without actual photos of the current barrier and specific physical measurements to calculate the value.

This project is a temporary velocity barrier 2-3 days a year, as estimated by the WDFW watershed steward, and has no effect on adult or juvenile migration. This project is not a barrier and should not have been submitted.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **Ellensburg Water Company**

Project Name: **YTAHP Currier Crk/EWC Canal Intersection**

Project Number: **04-1678 R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

YES

There are multiple downstream barriers limiting the potential for any anadromous species benefits at this site. This project is out of sequence with Project #15 (04-1677, Lower Currier Creek 2 Mile Passage).

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?
4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **South Naches Irrigation Dist**

Project Name: **Naches River Flow & Habitat Enhancement**

Project Number: **04-1683 N**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

YES

The location of the project and addressing in-stream flows is good, but a great deal of uncertainty surrounds many aspects of this project. The sequencing of this project, getting permits (Phase 1) prior to developing a conceptual design (Phase 2) seems problematic. There is insufficient information to evaluate the water savings and potential benefits to salmon.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **Kittitas Co Conservation Dist**

Project Name: **Lower Currier Creek 2 Mile Passage**

Project Number: **04-1677 R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?

YES

Why?

The location and scale of work seems good, but the lack of information on the project design for the 5 abandoned barrier structures and 2 active diversions are difficult to understand. It’s hard to evaluate the true benefit of the whole project.

This project is out of sequence with Project #13 (04-1678, YTAHP Currier Crk/EWC Canal Intersection).

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **Mid-Columbia RFEG**

Project Name: **Cle Elum Riparian Restoration, Phase 1**

Project Number: **04-1674 N**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Non-Capital**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

YES

It’s unclear that significant, if any, benefits to bull trout would be achieved from this project. The benefits of this type of project are low to relative costs. It’s not clear how this assessment will lead to restoration projects.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **Ahtanum Irrigation District**

Project Name: **Bull Trout Protection Shellneck Creek**

Project Number: **04-1684 R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **INELIGIBLE**

Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This project is ineligible for SRFB funding. Silvicultural treatments or other forest practices (activities covered by the Forest Practices Act or the Forest and Fish Agreement) are ineligible. (SRFB 5th Round – 2004 Policies and Project Selection Manual #18, page 14)



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Instructions: Each Technical Advisor (TA) group (there could be more than one TA reviewing a project) **should complete one form for each project reviewed within the lead entity area. Send a copy of this form to the SRFB Project Manager for the lead entity (listed in Manual 18b, Appendix I).**

SRFB Technical Advisor(s):

Date of Site Visit:

Sponsor representative on site:

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Project Sponsor: **North Yakima Conservation Dist**

Project Name: **YTAHP Stream Habitat Restoration**

Project Number: **04-1681 R**

Project Location:

Project Type: **Restoration**

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?

YES

Why?

It was not clear where habitat plan implementation activities would take place.
The team could not evaluate the benefits of this project.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This project is similar to the two SRFB-funded projects that the Yakima County.